



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,165	01/16/2001	Veronique Douin	05725.0827-00000	9808
22852	7590	08/11/2004	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 1300 I STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20005			WANG, SHENGJUN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/759,165

**Applicant(s)**

DOUIN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Shengjun Wang

**Art Unit**

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-69 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-17, 19-24, 26, 27, 29-34, 40-42 and 59-69 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 18, 25, 28, 38, 39 and 43-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/21/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

Receipt of applicants' remarks submitted May 21, 2004 is acknowledged.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 18, 25, 28, 38, 39, and 43-58 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sweger et al. (US patent 5,482,704, or record), in view of Matsumoto et al. (U.S. Patent 6,010,689) and Uchiyama et al. (US Patent 5,876,705).
3. Sweger teaches a hair compositions containing amino-multicarboxylate modified starch. See the claims. Example 1 illustrates a starch modified with z-chloroethylaminodipropionic acid (CEPA) (see col. 6, line 44 through col. 7, line 10). The starch derivatives provide thickening and emulsion stabilization and exhibit good appearance and feel to the skin (see col. 1, lines 32-37., col. 9, lines 60-63). The reference teaches that polyacrylic acid polymers such as Carbopol resins are the leading thickeners and emulsion stabilizers in the skin care and hair care markets. The reference further teaches that CEPA-modified starch gives stable viscosity over time and is superior to the Carbopol@ standard (see col. 9, lines 1-6).
4. Sweger does not teach expressly the other ingredients in the hair composition, such as conditioning agent behenyltrimethylammonium, or anionic surfactant alkyl ether sulfate.

Art Unit: 1617

However, it would have been prima facie obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed the invention was made, to use hair conditioning agents, and surfactants because those are well known essential ingredients normally used for hair compositions. For example, Matsumoto et al. teaches that behenyltrimethylammonium is a well-known hair conditioning agent, and alkyl ether sulfate are anionic surfactant known to be useful in hair composition. See, particularly, column 2, line 13 to column 3, line 36, column 5, lines 28-50, and column 7, lines 13-65. Uchiyama et al. teaches that a conditioning shampoo composition may comprise anionic surfactant, conditioning agent, such as behenyltrimethylammonium and thickener. See, particularly, the claims, and column 22, lines 34-55. Further, The optimization of a result effective parameter, e.g., optimal amounts of each known ingredients in a cosmetic composition, or a proper pH, is considered within the skill of the artisan. See, In re Boesch and Slaney (CCPA) 204 USPQ 215.

5. Claims 1-3, 18, 25, 28, 38, 39, and 43-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janchipraponvej (US Pat. 4,954,335) in view of Sweger et al (US Pat. 5,482,704) and Martino et al (US Pat. 6,210,689) and in further view of Uchiyama et al.

6. Janchipraponvej teaches clear conditioning compositions and methods to impart improved properties to hair. The compositions provide excellent wet comb and dry comb properties to the hair, and the hair demonstrates improved physical and cosmetic properties (see col. 7, lines 21-48). The compositions of Janchipraponvej contain quaternary ammonium compounds (see col. 8, line 8-47). Behenyltrimethylammonium chloride is specifically taught (see col. 10, lines 1-29). Weight percentages of the quaternary ammonium compound are taught (see col. 10, lines 30-45). The reference teaches the use of thickening agents such as polyacrylic

Art Unit: 1617

acid derivatives, and that the resulting compositions are relatively viscous compositions that are stable to phase separation for an indefinite period of time (see col. 16, lines 9-32). A preferred range of pH from 5.5 to 6.5 is taught (see col. 14, lines 5-18). Additional surfactants are included in the composition (see col. 14, line 19 through col. 15, line 18). The reference lacks modified starch and anionic surfactants.

7. Sweger teaches cosmetic compositions containing amino-multicarboxylate modified starch. Example 1 illustrates a starch modified with z-chloroethylaminodipropionic acid (CEPA) (see col. 6, line 44 through col. 7, line 10). The starch derivatives provide thickening and emulsion stabilization and exhibit good appearance and feel to the skin (see col. 1, lines 32-37., col. 9, lines 60-63). The reference teaches that polyacrylic acid polymers such as Carbopoll resins are the leading thickeners and emulsion stabilizers in the skin care and hair care markets. The reference further teaches that CEPA-modified starch gives stable viscosity over time and is superior to the Carbopol® standard (see col. 9, lines 1-6).

8. Martino teaches the use of alkyl ether sulfate salts as well known surfactants in cosmetic formulations (see col. 5, lines 1-26). The reference teaches that certain alkyl ether sulfate salts are particularly useful in combination with keratin treating cosmetic compositions containing amphoteric starch derivatives as disclosed in the reference (see abstract and col. 5, lines 16-17). Uchiyama et al. teaches that a conditioning shampoo composition may comprise anionic surfactant, conditioning agent, such as behenyltrimethylammonium and thickener. See, particularly, the claims, and column 22, lines 34-55.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the compositions of Janchipraponvej by the addition of amphoteric

Art Unit: 1617

starches as taught by Sweger and anionic surfactants as taught by Martino in order to benefit from the improved results of the amphoteric starches with respect to viscosity and thickening as taught by Sweger.

***Response to the Arguments***

Applicants remarks submitted May 21, 2004 have been fully considered, but are not persuasive for reasons discussed below.

9. Applicants allege that the rejections over Sweger et al. in view of Matsumoto et al. and Uchiyama et al. are grounded neither in the law, nor in the teaching of the references relied upon simply because the rejection relied on what is "normally used." The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so *found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art*. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the teaching, suggestion and motivation are provided both in the cited references and in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Particularly, hair conditioners and surfactants are well-known essential ingredients normally used for hair compositions (knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art), and the cited references teach the particular hair conditioners and surfactant are known to be used in hair composition similar those herein claimed.

Art Unit: 1617

10. Applicants further assert the examiner employed an "obvious to try" standard for making the rejections, but fail to point out the characteristics residing on the claimed invention, which characteristics could not be realized by other hair conditioner and/or surfactant.

As to the particular examples disclosed in the cited prior art, note, question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is not merely what reference expressly teach, but what they would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made; all disclosures of prior art, including unpreferred embodiments, must be considered. In re Lamberti and Konort (CCPA), 192 USPQ 278.

With respect to the rejections over Janchipraponvej et al., applicants argue that the citation of Michalek is improper since Michalek is particularly directed to operability of a patent. The examiner disagrees. The court reached the decision based on the rationale that "that it is not a difficult matter to carry out a process in such a fashion that it will not be successful and, therefore, the failures of experimenters who have no interest in succeeding should not be accorded great weight" This rationale is suitable for the instant situation. As pointed in the prior office action, "one of ordinary skill in the art would have not expected that CEPA carbomer have identical properties, including solubility. Therefore, the detailed procedure for making CEPA solution would not be the same as those for carbomer." In fact, the court particularly states "Skilled workers would as a matter of course, in our opinion, if they do not immediately obtain desired results, make certain experiments and adaptations and we agree with the argument of the solicitor that it is not a difficult matter to carry out a process in such fashion that it will not be successful and, therefore, the failures of experimenters who have no interest in succeeding

Art Unit: 1617

should not be accorded great weight, citing *Bullard Company et al. v. Coe*, 147 F.2d 568, 64 USPQ 359. Possibly more extensive experiments than were made by the affiants herein might have produced a different result.”

As to the motivation to combine the references, the examiner maintained that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so *found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art*. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the teaching, suggestion and motivation are provided both in the cited references and in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

11. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Particularly, considering the cited references as a whole, in view the known advantages of CEPA and the other ingredients in hair composition and general knowledge available to one of ordinary skill in cosmetic art, the claimed invention, which employ CEPA and other conventional hair care ingredients, would have been obvious to the artisans in cosmetic art.

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).



A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shengjun Wang, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0632. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9302.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

**SHENGJUN WANG**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Shengjun Wang

August 6, 2004